

1 Brian C. Rocca, S.B #221576
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com
2 Sujal J. Shah, S.B #215230
sujal.shah@morganlewis.com
3 Michelle Park Chiu, S.B #248421
michelle.chiu@morganlewis.com
4 Minna Lo Naranjo, S.B #259005
minna.naranjo@morganlewis.com
5 Rishi P. Satia, S.B #301958
rishi.satia@morganlewis.com
6 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**
One Market, Spear Street Tower
7 San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 442-1000
8 Facsimile: (415) 422-1001
9 Richard S. Taffet, *pro hac vice*
richard.taffet@morganlewis.com
10 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**
101 Park Avenue
11 New York, NY 10178
Telephone: (212) 309-6000
12 Facsimile: (212) 309-6001
Attorneys for Defendants Google LLC, et al.

13 *Counsel for Defendants*

14 Glenn D. Pomerantz, Bar No. 112503
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
15 Kuruvilla Olasa, Bar No. 281509
kuruvilla.olasa@mto.com
Nicholas R. Sidney
nick.sidney@mto.com
16 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**
350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 683-9100
17 Kyle W. Mach, Bar No. 282090
kyle.mach@mto.com
Justin P. Raphael, Bar No. 292380
justin.raphael@mto.com
18 Emily C. Curran-Huberty, Bar No. 293065
emily.curran-huberty@mto.com
Dane P. Shikman, Bar No. 313656
dane.shikman@mto.com
19 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**
560 Mission Street, Twenty Seventh Fl.
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 512-4000
20 Jonathan I. Kravis, *pro hac vice*
jonathan.kravis@mto.com
21 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**
601 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Ste 500E
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 220-1100

22 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
23 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
24 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

25 **IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE**
ANTITRUST LITIGATION,
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.,
Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD
Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al.,
Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

26 **DECLARATION OF CHRISTIAN**
CRAMER IN SUPPORT OF GOOGLE'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
UNDER SEAL

27 Judge: Hon. James Donato

28 Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

1 I, Christian Cramer, declare as follows

2 A. I am currently a Finance Director for Non-Party Google LLC (along with Google-
 3 affiliated entities, “Google”). I have been employed by Google since September 2007 and have
 4 held my current position since March 2017. Over the course of my employment at Google, I have
 5 acquired personal knowledge of Google’s practices and procedures concerning the maintenance of
 6 the confidentiality of its strategic, business, and marketing information.

7 B. I submit this declaration in support of the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal
 8 filed on October 21, 2022 in *In re Google Play Store Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:21-md-
 9 02981-JD, *Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD, and *Match Group,*
 10 *LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD.

11 C. The facts set forth in this declaration are true and correct to the best of my
 12 knowledge, information, and belief, and are based on my personal knowledge of Google’s policies
 13 and practices as they relate to the treatment of confidential information, the materials that were
 14 provided to me and reviewed by me, and/or conversations with other knowledgeable employees of
 15 Google. If called upon as a witness in this action, I could and would testify from my personal
 16 knowledge and knowledge acquired from sources with factual foundation.

17 D. As a matter of routine practice and internal policy, Google and its employees
 18 strictly treat as confidential, *inter alia*, (i) internal, non-public financial information; (ii) non-
 19 public commercial proposals to third parties; (iii) non-public agreements with third parties; (iv)
 20 internal surveys and analyses of customer preferences, spending, revenue, market conditions,
 21 business strategy, competitive dynamics, and commercial opportunities; (v) non-public financial
 22 forecasts and business plans; (vi) trade secrets; and (vii) other sensitive material that, if publicly
 23 disclosed, could potentially enable Google’s competitors to undermine Google’s competitive
 24 position in the marketplace, allow current or prospective business partners or counterparties to
 25 take unfair advantage of Google in negotiations or other business affairs, violate Google’s
 26 confidentiality obligations to third parties, or otherwise prejudice Google’s business interests. In
 27 my experience and to the best of my knowledge, Google does not disclose internal documents,
 28 data, or information of this nature outside of the company, except to authorized third parties when

1 so required or permitted by law or contract. To that end and in order to prevent inadvertent
2 revelation of this information to the public, Google has several policies in place like prohibiting
3 employees from accessing information beyond what is reasonably necessary to perform their
4 duties, limiting access to certain internal systems, permitting access to document databases on a
5 need-to-know basis, and requiring the use of an encrypted email system. I am also aware that,
6 generally, Google employees are required to sign a confidentiality agreement requiring each
7 employee to keep information confidential, and shared only within the company.

8 E. Third parties—including Google’s customers, suppliers, business partners, and
9 others who interact or transact with Google in an array of contexts—entrust highly sensitive, non-
10 public, and confidential information to Google every day. These third parties have an expectation
11 that Google can and will protect the confidentiality of that information. In many cases, Google is
12 contractually bound to keep that information confidential. In my experience and to the best of my
13 knowledge, Google does not disclose internal documents, data, or information reflecting third
14 parties’ confidential information outside of the company, unless and only to the extent it has been
15 authorized (or is lawfully permitted or required) to do so. Rather, as noted above, Google policies
16 and protocols are designed to ensure the confidentiality of third-party material is strictly
17 maintained.

18 F. I understand that the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal requests that the
19 Court maintain the specific information identified below under seal. For the reasons stated below,
20 this information is confidential and highly sensitive, and if publicly disclosed, could significantly
21 prejudice Google's competitive position by harming Google's relationship with business partners,
22 putting Google at unfair disadvantage in future business negotiations, and permitting Google's
23 competitors to gain unfair advantage in competition with Google.

Specific Information to Be Sealed

Defendants' Opposition to Epic's and Match' Motions to Amend Complaints

[Dkt. No. 355]

27 1. **Page 3, lines 25 (between “developer” and “as ‘illustrative’”).** This text
28 contains confidential, non-public information regarding a non-party developer and implicates the

1 non-party's confidentiality interests by revealing the identity of that developer, specific deal terms
 2 and financial considerations between Google and that developer, when the developer has a
 3 reasonable expectation that Google will maintain the confidentiality of contractual agreements and
 4 negotiations. Further, disclosure of this non-public information is likely to result in competitive
 5 harm to Google, as it reveals strategic decision-making which, for example, could give a
 6 competitor or potential business partner unfair leverage in competing against or negotiating with
 7 Google. Moreover, Google's competitors could use this non-party information to unfairly target
 8 Google's developer partners and offer specific deal terms designed to undercut those offered by
 9 Google.

10 2. **Page 5, lines 4-7 (between “They allege that, through ‘Project Hug,’ Google”**
11 and end of sentence). This text contains confidential, non-public information regarding Google’s
 12 contractual agreements with non-party developers. Public disclosure of this information is likely
 13 to result in competitive harm to Google, as it reveals Google’s strategic decision-making , which,
 14 for example, could give a competitor or potential business partner unfair leverage in competing
 15 against or negotiating with Google. Moreover, Google's competitors could use this non-party
 16 information to unfairly target Google's developer partners.

17 3. **Page 5, lines 13-14 (between “reached with” and “*Id.*”).** This text contains
 18 confidential, non-public information regarding a non-party developer, and implicates the non-
 19 party’s confidentiality interests, by revealing the identity of a Google business partner who is not
 20 party to this litigation, and who has a reasonable expectation that Google will maintain the
 21 confidentiality of contractual terms and its own confidential statements made during negotiations.
 22 Further, disclosure of this non-public information is likely to result in competitive harm to Google,
 23 as it reveals strategic decision-making, which, for example, could give a competitor or potential
 24 business partner unfair leverage in competing against or negotiating with Google. Moreover,
 25 Google's competitors could use this non-party information to unfairly target Google's developer
 26 partners.

27 4. **Page 6, line 27 (between “developers identified in the motions—” and “—were**
28 produced”). This text contains confidential, non-public information regarding a non-party

1 developer, and implicates the non-party's confidentiality interests, by revealing the identity of a
 2 Google business partner who is not party to this litigation, and who has a reasonable expectation
 3 that Google will maintain the confidentiality of contractual terms and its own confidential
 4 statements made during negotiations. Further, disclosure of this non-public information is likely
 5 to result in competitive harm to Google, as it reveals strategic decision-making, which, for
 6 example, could give a competitor or potential business partner unfair leverage in competing
 7 against or negotiating with Google. Moreover, Google's competitors could use this non-party
 8 information to unfairly target Google's developer partners

9 5. **Page 7, lines 4-5 (between “focused questioning,” and “, at his deposition nine**
 10 **months ago.”).** This text contains confidential, non-public information regarding a non-party
 11 developer, and implicates the non-party's confidentiality interests, by revealing the identity of a
 12 Google business partner who is not party to this litigation, and who has a reasonable expectation
 13 that Google will maintain the confidentiality of contractual terms and its own confidential
 14 statements made during negotiations. Further, disclosure of this non-public information is likely
 15 to result in competitive harm to Google, as it reveals strategic decision-making, which, for
 16 example, could give a competitor or potential business partner unfair leverage in competing
 17 against or negotiating with Google. Moreover, Google's competitors could use this non-party
 18 information to unfairly target Google's developer partners.

19 6. **Page 7, line 8 (between “developers,’ including” and ““to stop them from””).**
 20 This text contains confidential, non-public information regarding a non-party app developer and
 21 implicates the non-party's confidentiality interests by revealing the identity of that developer and
 22 its statements made during negotiations, when that developer has a reasonable expectation that
 23 Google will maintain the confidentiality of those negotiations and related contractual agreements.
 24 Further, disclosure of this non-public information is likely to result in competitive harm to Google,
 25 as it reveals the company's internal strategic decision-making, which, for example, could give a
 26 competitor or potential business partner unfair leverage in competing against or negotiating with
 27 Google. Additionally, Google's competitors could use this non-party information to unfairly target
 28 Google's developer partners.

1 7. **Page 7, lines 20-22 (between start of sentence and “and Google employee”;**
 2 **between “testified that Google and” and “never entered”; between “an agreement that” and**
 3 **“would not open”; and between “Ex. D” and “Dep.”).** This text contains confidential, non-
 4 public information regarding a non-party app developer and implicates the non-party’s
 5 confidentiality interests by revealing the identity of that developer, when that developer has a
 6 reasonable expectation that Google will maintain the confidentiality of those negotiations and
 7 related contractual agreements. Further, disclosure of this non-public information is likely to
 8 result in competitive harm to Google, as it reveals the company’s internal strategic decision-
 9 making, which, for example, could give a competitor or potential business partner unfair leverage
 10 in competing against or negotiating with Google. Additionally, Google’s competitors could use
 11 this non-party information to unfairly target Google’s developer partners.

12 8. **Page 10, line 24 (between “amendments mention,” and “, but they also”).** This
 13 text contains confidential, non-public information regarding Google’s contractual agreements with
 14 non-party developers. Public disclosure of this information is likely to result in competitive harm
 15 to Google, as it reveals Google’s strategic decision-making , which, for example, could give a
 16 competitor or potential business partner unfair leverage in competing against or negotiating with
 17 Google. Moreover, Google’s competitors could use this non-party information to unfairly target
 18 Google’s developer partners.

19

20 **Pomerantz Declaration iso Opposition to Epic’s and Match’ Motions to Amend Complaints**
 21 **[Dkt. No. 355]**

22 9. **Ex. C to Pomerantz Declaration (M. Marchak Dep. Tr.), page 382:24 (between**
 23 **“recollection” and end of line).** This text contains confidential, non-public information
 24 regarding non-party developers and implicates the non-parties’ confidentiality interests by
 25 revealing the identity of those developers, when the non-party developers have a reasonable
 26 expectation of confidentiality. This text further reflects the substance of commercially sensitive
 27 discussions relating to those developers’ business strategies, and discussion of confidential
 28 commercial agreements with those developers. Public disclosure of this information could cause

1 competitive harm to both non-parties and to Google. For example, Google's competitors could
 2 use this information in their own commercial negotiations to obtain a competitive advantage
 3 against Google with respect to deal terms. With respect to the non-parties, disclosure of their non-
 4 public, confidential discussions with Google could negatively affect their relationship with Google
 5 and future business dealings.

6 **10. Ex. C to Pomerantz Declaration (M. Marchak Dep. Tr.), page 383:1-6**
 7 (**between start of page and “I don’t”; and between “more details” and “We’ll get”**). This
 8 text contains confidential, non-public information regarding non-party developers and implicates
 9 the non-parties' confidentiality interests by revealing the identity of those developers, when the
 10 non-party developers have a reasonable expectation of confidentiality. This text further reflects
 11 the substance of commercially sensitive discussions relating to those developers' business
 12 strategies, and discussion of confidential commercial agreements with those developers. Public
 13 disclosure of this information could cause competitive harm to both non-parties and to Google.
 14 For example, Google's competitors could use this information in their own commercial
 15 negotiations to obtain a competitive advantage against Google with respect to deal terms. With
 16 respect to the non-parties, disclosure of their non-public, confidential discussions with Google
 17 could negatively affect their relationship with Google and future business dealings.

18 **11. Ex. C to Pomerantz Declaration (M. Marchak Dep. Tr.), page 384:12-14**
 19 (**between “not only” and “considered their own”**). This text contains confidential, non-public
 20 information regarding non-party developers and implicates the non-parties' confidentiality
 21 interests by revealing the identity of those developers, when the non-party developers have a
 22 reasonable expectation of confidentiality. This text further reflects the substance of commercially
 23 sensitive discussions relating to those developers' business strategies, and discussion of
 24 confidential commercial agreements with those developers. Public disclosure of this information
 25 could cause competitive harm to both non-parties and to Google. For example, Google's
 26 competitors could use this information in their own commercial negotiations to obtain a
 27 competitive advantage against Google with respect to deal terms. With respect to the non-parties,
 28

1 disclosure of their non-public, confidential discussions with Google could negatively affect their
2 relationship with Google and future business dealings.

3 12. Because the public disclosure of the confidential material described above would
4 harm Google's competitive position in the marketplace, there is good cause and there are
5 compelling reasons to seal this material.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on this
2 20th day of October 2022 in Wailea, Maui County, Hawaii.

3 DocuSigned by:

4
5 
6 Christian Cramer
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Christian Cramer B4481B12EA7742A...